

**Technology Customer Council Meeting/Conference Call  
Minutes of June 27, 2008**

**Draft**

Present: Greg Wright, Kevin VandeWall\*, Rich Jacobs, Steve Mosena, Joel Lunde\*, Gary Kendell\*, Roberta Polzin\*

Absent: Mark Brandsgard, Evelyn Halterman, Larry Murphy, Lesa Quinn, Keith Greiner

Guests: Carl Martin\*, Greg Fay, Lorrie Tritch, John Gillispie, Diane Van Zante, Lana Morrissey, Laura Riordan, Mark Uhrin, Michael Tutty, Randy Clemenson (partial)

\* Participating by phone

1. **Call to Order** – Greg Wright.  
Greg Wright, Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:06 a.m. It was noted that a quorum of members was in attendance.
2. **Approve Minutes of June 10, 2008** – Greg Wright.  
Joel Lunde moved approval of the June 10, 2008 meeting minutes; Rich Jacobs seconded the motion. An oral vote was taken, unanimously approving the minutes as written.
3. **Financial Report for May**  
Financial summaries were presented for the Directory Services Utility and the Information Security Office Utility. There were no questions; the summaries were accepted as offered.
4. **Revised FY09 ISO Rate Projections** – Greg Fay.  
Each year, the Information Security Office (ISO) examines the list of potential customers to determine if any of the non-participating agencies have an interest in participating. At the June 10 meeting, Larry Murphy indicated that he will recommend that the Judicial Branch use funds to purchase Sophos rather than to participate in the ISO utility. The DAS Finance Office created a spreadsheet that shows the impact of Judicial dropping the service. There is an impact. For smaller departments it is relatively insignificant, however for larger departments, it is more significant since it is based on FTEs.
5. **FY10 Service Oriented Architecture (SOA) Utility** –  
Three models are being presented for your consideration, however each model has two subsets (one based on purchasing new equipment, the other utilizing existing equipment). The first model is based on usage, purely on FTEs.  
Another model utilizes a flat rate for predefined “small,” “medium,” and “large” sized agencies plus a percentage based on usage.  
A third model is based on each agency paying a flat rate plus a percentage that is based on utilization.

There are pros and cons to each approach.

Is it an accurate statement that SOA and A & A have already been designated as utilities? Yes, the Governor has made that decision. Steve Mosenen asked to have his comments entered into the record: "We are driving customer demand, not following what customers want or ask for. This is not a direction that we should be taking."

Michael Tutty outlined the three options in greater detail.

Option one: allocation by FTEs, all costs divided by FTEs in participating agencies.

Option two: partial allocation (64%) by size of agency using pre-determined designations of small/medium/large and partial allocation (36%) based on FTEs. This approach proposes what portion of the total amount should be based on usage and what portion should be based on a flat fee.

Option three: 64% of the fee would be based on FTEs and the remainder on usage. Usage would be based on cost divided by number of clicks.

As previously stated, there are two scenarios for each option (new equipment or existing CJIS equipment). The difference between the two is pretty dramatic. There are two sets of agency impacts for each option.

Discussion:

Rich Jacobs: There are pros and cons to each method. We should try to keep the model as simple as we can. The big payers under either model are DAS and DOT. If we want the fee to contain a usage component, Rich favors option three.

Steve Mosenen: I would prefer a usage component, so am not in favor of option one. Of the two remaining options, I would pick option two.

Greg Wright: I believe there should be a usage component and am leaning toward option three.

Joel Lunde: Favor option three.

Kevin VandeWall: Favor option three.

Gary Kendell: Favor option three.

Roberta Polzin: Favor option three.

Joel Lunde offered the following motion in favor of option three:

*The Technology Customer Council approves a Service Oriented Architecture rate methodology for FY10 whereby 64% of the fee is based on FTEs and 36% is based on usage. The fee will be based upon budgeted expenses of \$132,000 or lesser amount if it can be accomplished and a divisor of full-time/part-time personnel as of the 3<sup>rd</sup> quarter of FY 2008. These tentatively approved rates will be opened to the customary 30-day comment period in July and referred to the Department of Management and the new customer council for final action.*

Rich Jacobs seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken:

Roberta Polzin – yes  
Kevin VandeWall – yes  
Joel Lunde – yes  
Rich Jacobs – yes  
Greg Wright – yes  
Steve Mosenen – abstain  
Gary Kendell – yes

The motion passed.

**6. FY10 Authentication and Authorization (A & A) Utility**

Three options are being presented.

Option 1: straight FTEs, no usage

Option 2: 64% flat fee based on small/medium/large designation; 36% based on usage

Option 3: 64% flat fee based on FTEs; 36% based on usage

All three options utilize the same budget. We do have some history on this service, so can more accurately predict usage.

Note: Although the impact statement splits some agencies into distinct programs/units, DAS' intent is to deal with agencies as a whole (one entity). As such, it would be up to the agency to determine how to allocate fees within the agency.

Joel Lunde offered the following motion in favor of option three:

*The Technology Customer Council approves an Authentication and Authorization rate methodology for FY10 whereby 64% of the fee is based on FTEs and 36% is based on usage. The fee will be based upon budgeted expenses of \$163,594.49 and a divisor of full-time/part-time personnel as of the 3<sup>rd</sup> quarter of FY 2008. These tentatively approved rates will be opened to the customary 30-day comment period in July and referred to the Department of Management and the new customer council for final action.*

Rich Jacobs seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken:

Roberta Polzin – yes  
Kevin VandeWall – yes  
Joel Lunde – yes  
Rich Jacobs – yes  
Greg Wright – yes  
Steve Mosenen – yes  
Gary Kendell – yes

The motion passed.

7. **Wrap-Up and Thank You** – Greg Wright.

Effective July 1, 2008, the four DAS Customer Councils are being consolidated into one group which will be administered by the Department of Management. We wish to thank all who have served on the Technology Customer Council over the past five years.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:47 a.m.

DRAFT